

# **Draft FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

## **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT ADDRESSING THE CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A UNIT TRAINING EQUIPMENT SITE AND THE ADDITION OF TWO NEW BUILDINGS AT THE REGIONAL TRAINING INSTITUTE AT CAMP EDWARDS, MASSACHUSETTS**

### **Introduction**

The Massachusetts Army National Guard (MAARNG) prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) to evaluate the MAARNG's proposal to construct and operate a replacement Unit Training Equipment Site (UTES) with associated infrastructure and facilities and to construct and operate two additional buildings for the Massachusetts Regional Training Institute (RTI) at Camp Edwards in Barnstable County, Massachusetts. The MAARNG prepared the EA in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended (42 United States Code [U.S.C.] Section 4321–4347); the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500–1508); and the *Army National Guard Manual for Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969* (NEPA Handbook October 2011 edition).

### **1. Description Of The Proposed Action**

**Proposed Action.** Under the Proposed Action, the MAARNG would construct and operate a replacement UTES with associated infrastructure and facilities and construct and operate two additional buildings for the Massachusetts RTI at Camp Edwards, Massachusetts. The UTES and RTI projects would be distinct components of this Proposed Action and would be completed on schedules independent from one another.

The UTES component of the Proposed Action would entail the construction of a replacement UTES at the southwestern corner of the former Boeing Michigan Aeronautical Research Center (BOMARC) Missile Complex, approximately 1,200 feet to the west of the existing UTES (Building 4601). The proposed UTES would be a single-story facility that would measure 49,044 square feet (ft<sup>2</sup>). The facility would include eight vehicle work-bays and a central administration area. An approximately 14-acre storage lot, secured with perimeter fencing, would be constructed surrounding the proposed UTES for the storage of government-owned vehicles and equipment. This lot would include approximately 1.8-acres of concrete pavement with the remainder composed of flexible surface and crushed stone. An asphalt-paved privately owned vehicle parking lot with the capacity for 70 cars would be constructed immediately to the west of the proposed UTES. Demolition of the existing UTES would be completed following construction of the proposed facility, and an approximately 20,000-ft<sup>2</sup> controlled-humidity building would be constructed on the site of the existing UTES following its demolition. In total, no more than 15 acres would be disturbed from the construction of the proposed UTES, demolition of the existing UTES, and the construction of the controlled-humidity building. Because the areas to be disturbed are already covered with pavement and crushed stone and because following construction the amount of concrete and crushed stone surface would be similar to current conditions, no net change in the amount of impervious and semi-impervious surface would be expected. Construction and demolition for the UTES component of the Proposed Action is anticipated to occur in Fiscal Year (FY) 2013.

The RTI component of the Proposed Action would entail the construction of a 25,913-ft<sup>2</sup> education building and a 32,125-ft<sup>2</sup> barracks for the RTI. The proposed buildings would be sited in the 5200 Area of Camp Edwards in the vicinity of the existing RTI education and barracks buildings. Appropriate landscaping would be conducted following the construction of the proposed facilities and would include the construction of approximately 4,000 ft<sup>2</sup> of new sidewalks. The construction of these buildings would require the existing RTI parking lot to be reconfigured in order to meet anti-terrorism/force-protection parking standoff requirements. The reconfiguration of the parking lot would result in the removal of 30 car parking spaces and 7 bus parking spaces, leaving 142 car spaces and no bus parking spaces at the RTI campus. Construction for the RTI component of the Proposed Action is anticipated to occur in FY 2013.

**Alternative Considered.** Alternative layouts and locations for the UTES and RTI were considered by the MAARNG for this EA. These alternatives considered various placements of the UTES at the former BOMARC Missile Complex, locating the UTES at the 2800, 3300, and 3600 Areas of Camp Edwards, and locating the RTI at the 3400 Area. Each of these alternative layouts and locations were found not to be reasonable and were eliminated from further detailed analysis in the EA.

In addition to these alternatives, the MAARNG evaluated the No Action Alternative. The No Action Alternative refers to a continuation of existing conditions without implementation of the Proposed Action. Under the No Action Alternative, a replacement UTES and additional buildings for the RTI would not be constructed and the existing facilities would remain in operation. No construction, demolition, or ground disturbance would occur. If this alternative is chosen, then the MAARNG would continue to operate in substandard, inappropriately-equipped facilities that would impact on troop morale and effect equipment and ultimately soldier mission readiness. While the No Action Alternative would not satisfy the purpose of or need for the Proposed Action, it was analyzed in detail in this EA in accordance with CEQ regulations.

The Preferred Alternative is the Proposed Action. The proposed UTES would be constructed at the southwestern corner of the former BOMARC site in the vicinity of the existing UTES. The proposed RTI buildings would be constructed at the 5200 Area of the installation in the vicinity of the existing RTI buildings.

## **2. Environmental Analysis**

Based on the analysis contained in the EA, it has been determined that the Proposed Action will have no significant effects on the resources considered in this document. Non-significant adverse and beneficial effects will occur to air quality, noise, earth resources, water resources, biological resources, socioeconomic and environmental justice, infrastructure, and hazardous materials and wastes.

**Mitigation Measures.** No mitigation measures will be necessary to reduce any adverse environmental impacts to below significant levels. Standard best management practices (BMPs) for construction- and demolition-related activities would be implemented to minimize the non-significant, adverse effects from the Proposed Action. BMPs would potentially include:

- Use water to minimize fugitive particular matter emissions during construction and demolition.

- Performing maintenance on construction and demolition equipment to potentially lessen their noise levels or replace older equipment with newer, quieter equipment. Use improved mufflers, equipment redesign, intake silencers, ducts, and engine enclosures and noise-attenuating shields or shrouds on all equipment and trucks.
- Use exhaust mufflers on compressed air exhaust and use acoustical shielding on stationary equipment when feasible.
- Install silt fencing and sediment traps, apply water to disturbed soil, and revegetate disturbed areas as soon as possible after the disturbance to control erosion, as appropriate.
- Site new facilities to avoid or minimize effects on wetlands and natural resources.
- In the event of a release of hazardous materials, the installation's Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasures Plan would be followed to quickly contain and clean up the release.
- Replant areas disturbed with native vegetation or approved grass seed mixtures following construction and demolition activities.
- Allow wildlife to move out of the path of construction equipment.
- Implement properly designed and maintained erosion and sediment controls and storm water management practices during construction to minimize the potential for any adverse effects on wetlands. Implementation of storm water pollution BMPs during and after construction would minimize the potential for adverse effects associated with runoff from the new facilities.
- In the event that archaeological materials or human remains are inadvertently discovered during construction activities, the MAARNG would follow the procedures outlined in Standard Operating Procedure 5 in the installation's Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan.

### **3. Regulations**

The Proposed Action would not violate NEPA, the CEQ Regulations, 32 CFR Part 651, *Environmental Analysis of Army Action*, or any other Federal, state, or local environmental regulations.

### **4. Commitment to Implementation**

The National Guard Bureau (NGB) and the MAARNG affirm their commitment to implement this EA in accordance with NEPA. Implementation is dependent on funding. The MAARNG and the NGB's Environmental Programs, Training, and Installation Divisions will ensure that adequate funds are requested in future years' budgets to achieve the goals and objectives set forth in this EA.

### **5. Public Review and Comment**

The Draft EA was made available for 30-day agency review and comment period beginning on 17 July 2012. A separate 30-day review and comment period was held for the Environmental Management Commission beginning on 03 October 2012.

The Final EA and Draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FNSI) will be available for public review and comment for 30 days following publication of the public notice. The Final EA and Draft FNSI will be available for review at <http://www.eandrc.org>, or may be requested from the MAARNG. Interested parties are invited to review the Final EA and submit written comments before the close of the public comment period. Written comments and inquiries should be directed by mail to: Ms. Emily Derbyshire Kelly, Community Involvement Specialist, Environmental & Readiness Center, Building 1204 West Inner Road, Camp Edwards, MA 02542; fax: 508-968-5144; email: [emily.d.kelly2.nfg@mail.mil](mailto:emily.d.kelly2.nfg@mail.mil).

## **6. Draft Finding Of No Significant Impact**

After review of the EA, I have concluded that implementation of the Proposed Action would not generate significant controversy or have a significant impact on the quality of the human or natural environment. Per 32 CFR Part 651, the Final EA and Draft FNSI will be made available for a 30-day public review and comment period. Once any public comments have been addressed, and if a final determination is made that the Proposed Action will have no significant impact, the FNSI will be signed and the Proposed Action will be implemented. This analysis fulfills the requirements of NEPA and CEQ Regulations. An Environmental Impact Statement will not be prepared, and the National Guard Bureau is issuing this Finding of No Significant Impact.

<unsigned for draft>

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Michael Ahn  
Colonel, U.S. Army  
Chief, Environmental Programs Division